DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 034 TM 008 035

AUTHOR Fruchter, Dorothy A.
TITLE An Evaluation Report of the TATTLETOOTH Dental Program (Covering Ongoing Evaluation, 1977-1978).
INSTITUTION Educational Development Corp., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY Texas State Dept. of Health Resources, Austin. Bureau of Dental Health.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 55p.; Parts marginally legible due to small print and some light type

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Evaluation; *Dental Evaluation; *Dental Health; Elementary Secondary Education; *Health Education; Hygiene; *Program Evaluation; *Surveys; *Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

The 1977-1978 evaluation of the TATTLETOOTH program included a dental screening of 5,071 school children in 5 counties. A group of 905 of these children were given, in addition, a post-test after receiving the dental education program. A control group of 672 were post-tested without having the program. Teachers were asked their opinions of the program, especially of the assistance of trained dental hygienists. Results of the screening suggest that dental problems are highly prevalent in this sample, and that a preventive program, concentrating on proper cleaning, is needed. The experimental dental evaluation indicates that the TATTLETOOTH dental-educational program is effective in improving cleaning effectiveness, and the teacher questionnaire responses support the involvement of dental hygienists as a valuable component of the program. The results suggest that more effort be made in the future to teach effective cleaning of molars. Extensive data tables are appended. (Author/CTM)

ED163034

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN

EVALUATION REPORT

OF THE

TATTLETOOTH

DENTAL PROGRAM

(COVERING ONGOING EVALUATION, 1977-1978)

prepared by

DOROTHY A. FRUCHTER, PH.D.

of the

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

2813 RIO GRANDE

AUSTIN, TEXAS 78705

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George M. Higginson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM"

for

BUREAU OF DENTAL HEALTH

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

1100 WEST 49TH STREET

AUSTIN, TEXAS 78756

AUGUST 1978

TM008 035

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Introduction	1
Scope of the 1977-78 Evaluation	1
The Gross Dental Screening	2
The Experimental Study	6
Dental Hygienist Evaluation	9
Summary	12

Tables and Figures

TABLE A - Gross Screening Sample 1977-1978	2
Figure 1 - The Papillary Marginal Attachment Index (Modified)*	4
TABLE 1 - Analysis of Covariance - Papillary Marginal Attachment Index (PMA)	7
TABLE 2 - Analysis of Covariance - Patient Hygiene Performance (PHP)	8
TABLE 3 - Analysis of Variance (Interaction, Pretest-Posttest/ Experimental-Control Group)	10
TABLE 4 - Analysis of Variance (Interaction, Pretest-Posttest/Experimental-Control Group)	11

Appendices

APPENDIX A - Dental Survey Data--All Counties
APPENDIX B - Dental Survey Data by Counties
APPENDIX C - Teacher Evaluation Results
Totals by School Districts
Totals of all Districts

TATTLETOOTH Evaluation Report

1977 - 1978

Introduction

TATTLETOOTH is a dental-educational program co-sponsored by the Texas Department of Health, the Texas Dental Association, and the Texas Education Agency. It was designed to teach children from kindergarten to high school how to brush and floss correctly, eat properly for dental health, and generally care for their teeth intelligently. The lessons were tailored for the different grade levels in a way that would achieve maximum motivation, stressing personal and social enhancement, humor, and interesting material.

In a major field test (15,000 children in 18 Educational Service Regions) carried out in 1975-76, a single exposure to this program was found to increase knowledge about dental health significantly at all grade levels and to decrease plaque about 15% in a sample of 2142 children selected at random. The program was judged helpful and effective by over 80% of the teachers, but evaluation questions suggested that they felt a need for additional technical help with brushing and flossing.

Scope of the 1977-78 Evaluation

Since TATTLETOOTH is a program that attempts to improve dental attitudes and behavior through education, it is expected that the effects will be cumulative, and thus continuing evaluation is an integral facet of the approach. The 1977-1978 evaluation had three major goals, as follows:

1. a gross dental screening, to get an estimate of the prevalence of dental problems and to provide other base-rate data;
2. an experimental study of dental effectiveness, involving a pre-post examination design;
3. an evaluation of the services of a group of trained dental hygienists, to determine whether they provided the technical help previously requested by participating teachers.

The Gross Dental Screening

This aspect of the evaluation consisted of a screening questionnaire, filled in by dental hygienists, school nurses and volunteers, and a dental check by volunteer dentists and registered dental hygienists in the various communities served. A total of 507, school children were screened, from 1st, 3rd, and 5th grades, and junior and senior high schools in twelve school districts, in five counties. Table A shows the distribution of cases and locations of the screened sample.

TABLE A

Gross Screening Sample 1977-1978

County	Number	Grades	School District
Bexar	867	1	Lackland
		3	Southwest
		5	South San Antonio
			Southside
			Somersett
Medina	1123	1	Natalia-Devine
		3	Medina Valley
		5	Hondo
Hays	1261	1	Dripping Springs
		3	Hays
		5	San Marcos
Comal	1077	3	New Braunfels
		5	
		Jr. High	
		Sr. High	
Guadalupe	741	1	Seguin ISD
		3	
		5	

Tables in Appendices A and B give screening results. Appendix A presents the data by grade, giving totals for elementary and secondary students as well as a grand total. Appendix B shows the results by county.

The totals show that 43% of the children screened were Anglo, 47% were Chicano, almost 5% were Black, and less than 1% were "other," probably mostly Oriental. Socioeconomic data were provided by teachers, and the sample was 49% from blue-collar families, 33% from relatively affluent families, and 18% were from poverty-level homes.

For this sample of 5071 school children, 2835 (56%) need dental attention, 891 (18%) on an emergency basis. 14%, or 684 children, stated that their gums were sore. While most (97%) said they owned toothbrushes, and 91% said they brushed once a day or oftener, very few (37%) had access to floss, and 14% said they flossed regularly. Since flossing is an essential component of dental hygiene, a large majority of these children could not be cleaning their teeth effectively.

34% of the sample had not seen a dentist for a year or more, and an additional 33% indicated they had seen a dentist "sometime," but couldn't remember when. This latter group could include both children who had seen dentists quite awhile ago, and also who really did not know whether they had ever seen one, but responded positively to the question because of feeling social pressure. (This, of course, is an everpresent problem of self-report questionnaires, both with children and adults.) Although most (99%) of the parents were notified about their children's dental problems, only a few (11%) subsequently made appointments with dentists. 8% said that they lacked a source of dental care.

The results of the dental check are also presented in Appendices A and B. The indices used were the Papillary Marginal Attachment Index (modified),

henceforth referred to as the PMA, and the Patient Hygiene Performance (PHP), a measure of cleaning effectiveness. Figure 1 presents a description of the PMA.

Figure 1

THE PAPILLARY MARGINAL ATTACHMENT INDEX
(MODIFIED)*

P = Papilla - Triangular shaped gum area between each tooth.
M = Marginal Gingiva - Edge of the gum that outlines the tooth.
A = Attached Gingiva - Area of the gum below the margin, which appears to be attached.

The papillary, marginal and attached gingiva are assigned one of three numbers, each one correlating with the degree of inflammation observed.

0 =	Normal	No inflammation, stippling of attached gingiva
1 =	Moderate	Mild engorgement, slight increase in size
2 =	Severe	Obvious engorgement, bleeding upon pressure

*The index reflects a general condition occurring in most areas of the mouth rather than a score for one specific gingival area.

The PHP procedure consisted of examining five surfaces of six teeth, scoring each surface as clean or dirty. Thus each tooth could have a score from 0 to 5, with higher scores representing dirtier surfaces. An average was also computed for all six teeth. The list of teeth checked in this procedure is as follows:

#16, Upper Right First Molar
#11, Upper Right Central Incisor
#26, Upper Left First Molar
#36, Lower Left First Molar
#31, Lower Left Central Incisor
#46, Lower Right First Molar

Data covering the dental screening are also presented in Appendices A and B, by grade and by county. The total figures for the PMA suggest that the papillary gingiva show most signs of trouble, and the attached gingiva the least. There were enough gingival problems to raise average scores for the papillary gingiva above 1, which in itself indicates moderate engorgement or tenderness.

Total PHP scores show that elementary school children clean their teeth slightly less effectively than the older students (even in Comal County, where the junior and senior high school samples were tested). The Upper Right First Molar was generally found dirtiest, with a total average score of 3.85 in the elementary grades and 3.74 for the total sample. Generally cleanest was the Lower Left Central Incisor, with scores of 2.99 for the elementary grades and 2.88 for the total sample. The average scores for all six teeth were 3.41 for the elementary school children and 3.32 when junior and senior high school samples were included. These scores would suggest that the effectiveness of the dental hygiene practices of this sample of school students is fairly low, with more than half of the checked tooth surfaces unacceptably dirty.

The Experimental Study

The design chosen for this phase of TATTLETOOTH evaluation involved an experimental group of 905 children, randomly selected from the group described in the previous section of this report. In addition, a control group of 672 was chosen from schools that had not yet utilized the program. All of these subjects were examined by Dr. George Jurek, the reliability of whose dental procedures was checked during the Field Test Evaluation (1976) and found very high. (A single dentist was chosen to carry out all experimental testing partly in order to prevent variability due to inter-dentist differences, which was found to be a problem in earlier studies, and partly because of financial constraints.)

The PMA and PHP were completed on both groups, before and after the TATTLETOOTH program was used in the schools attended by the experimental group. (An additional index, the Decayed-Missing-Filled Surfaces, was also obtained during the pre-test to serve as base data in long-term evaluation).

In order to present data comparable to the 1976 Field Test evaluation results, analyses of covariance were computed for the PMA and PHP, comparing the post-test scores of the experimental and control groups, with the pre-test score differences held constant. The score differences and F-ratios are presented in Table 1 and 2.

Most of the F-ratios are significant, suggesting positive effects of the TATTLETOOTH program in producing cleaner tooth surfaces and fewer problems in two of the three gingival areas examined. (It would not be expected that the attached gingiva would show changes in response to such a program.) The only tooth that did not show a significant post-treatment change was the upper right first molar.

TABLE 1
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE
(Main effect: experimental vs. control posttest scores
covariate: pretest scores)
PAPILLARY MARGINAL ATTACHMENT INDEX (PMA)

Experimental Group; N=905 (dental pre-test, TATTLETOOTH program, dental post-test)

Control Group; N=672 (dental pre-test, no dental program, dental post-test)

	Mean (Pre)	Mean (Post)	F-ratio
Papillary			
Experimental	1.58	1.54	
Control	1.86	1.73	
			8.80**
Marginal			
Experimental	1.17	.95	
Control	1.59	1.26	
			18.85**
Attached Gingiva			
Experimental	.51	.29	
Control	.58	.41	
			.90
Total of PMA†			
Experimental	3.26	2.79	
Control	4.03	3.40	
Total	3.59	3.05	
			11.57**

(†For total averages, these means should be divided by 3)

** significant at the 1% level

TABLE 2
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE
(Main effect: experimental vs. control posttest scores
covariate: pretest scores)
PATIENT HYGIENE PERFORMANCE (PHP)

Experimental Group; N=905 (dental pre-test, TATTLETOOTH program, dental post-test)

Control Group; N=672 (dental pre-test, no dental program, dental post-test)

	Mean (Pre)	Mean (Post)	F-ratio
Upper Right, First Molar			
Experimental	3.39	3.53	
Control	3.29	3.46	
			2.11
Upper Right, Central			
Experimental	3.84	2.79	
Control	3.63	3.05	
			16.93**
Upper Left, First Molar			
Experimental	3.41	3.46	
Control	3.24	3.35	
			6.43*
Lower Left, First Molar			
Experimental	3.37	3.06	
Control	3.15	3.02	
			16.14**
Lower Left Central			
Experimental	3.51	2.75	
Control	3.29	2.95	20.27**
Lower Right, First Molar			
Experimental	3.95	3.05	
Control	3.82	3.10	
			6.37*
Total of PHP†			
Experimental	21.45	18.65	
Control	20.42	18.94	
Total	21.01	18.77	
			27.72**

(†For total averages, these means should be divided by 6)

* significant at the 5% level
** significant at the 1% level

TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
(INTERACTION, PRETEST-POSTTEST/
EXPERIMENTAL-CONTROL GROUP)

Experimental Group; N=905 (dental pre-test, TATTLETOOTH program, dental post-test)

Control Group; N=672 (dental pre-test, no dental program, dental post-test)

	Mean (Pre)	Mean (Post)	F-ratio
Papillary			
Experimental	1.58	1.54	
Control	1.86	1.73	
			.74
Marginal			
Experimental	1.17	.95	
Control	1.59	1.26	
			1.18
Attached Gingiva			
Experimental	.51	.29	
Control	.58	.41	
			.15
Total of PMA†			
Experimental	3.26	2.79	
Control	4.03	3.40	
Total	3.59	3.05	
			.44

(†For total averages, these means should be divided by 3)

TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
(INTERACTION, PRETEST-POSTTEST/
EXPERIMENTAL-CONTROL GROUP)

Experimental Group; N=905 (dental pre-test, TATTLETOOTH program, dental post-test)

Control Group; N=672 (dental pre-test, no dental program, dental post-test)

	Mean (Pre)	Mean (Post)	F-ratio
Upper Right, First Molar			
Experimental	3.39	3.53	
Control	3.29	3.46	
			.04
Upper Right, Central			
Experimental	3.84	2.79	
Control	3.63	3.05	
			37.17**
Upper Left, First Molar			
Experimental	3.41	3.46	
Control	3.24	3.35	
			.73
Lower Left, First Molar			
Experimental	3.37	3.06	
Control	3.15	3.02	
			10.47**
Lower Left, Central			
Experimental	3.51	2.75	
Control	3.29	2.95	
			32.51**
Lower Right, First Molar			
Experimental	3.95	3.05	
Control	3.82	3.10	
			8.43**
Total of PHP†			
Experimental	21.45	18.65	
Control	20.42	18.94	
Total	21.01	18.77	
			29.28**

(†For total averages, these means should be divided by 6)

** significant at the 1% level

All others, and the total score, were significant at least to the 5% level of confidence, with the incisors, the Lower Left First Molar, and the total being significant to the 1% level of confidence.

In addition to analyses of covariance, analyses of variance were computed for the dental experimental data. Though the test-retest design is not ideally suited to this statistical treatment, the analysis of variance is more robust and possibly more generally understood and easily interpreted. Because of the repeated measures, the reported F-ratios would probably be minimal estimates. F-ratios for the experimental-control/pretest-posttest interaction, for the PMA and PHP, are reported in Tables 3 and 4. (Means were reported in Tables 1 and 2.)

None of the interactions for the PMA were significant by this statistical test. For the PHP, the upper right and left first molars showed no significant effect, but all other teeth sampled, as well as the total score, showed improvement, with particularly noticeable and significant effects for the central teeth.

Dental Hygienist Evaluation

Comments of teachers responding to questionnaires distributed as part of the TATTLETOOTH Field Test Evaluation (1976) indicated that they felt a need for additional technical support, especially in dealing with brushing and flossing instruction. To answer this need four trained dental hygienists were recruited and assigned to give technical help to teachers using the program.

An evaluation instrument was distributed to teachers presenting the TATTLETOOTH program during this evaluation period, who were assisted by the hygienists. In addition to items about the program as a whole, the questionnaire

contained items about the effectiveness of the dental hygienists in providing technical support to classroom teachers. Results of this evaluation are presented, both as totals and by school district, in Appendix C. Results suggest that the hygienists were seen as helpful and effective by a large majority of the teachers responding (87%). Very few felt they could have managed as well without this support (8.2%), and it must be concluded that the involvement of trained dental hygienists is an important facet of the TATTLETOOTH program.

Summary

The 1977-1978 evaluation of the TATTLETOOTH program included a dental screening of 5071 school children in 12 school districts in 5 counties. A group of 905 of these children were given, in addition, a post-test after receiving the dental-educational program. A control group of 672 were post-tested without having the program. Teachers were asked their opinions of the program, especially of the assistance of trained dental hygienists.

Results of the screening suggest that dental problems are highly prevalent in this sample, and that a preventive program, concentrating on proper cleaning, is needed. The experimental dental evaluation indicates that the TATTLETOOTH dental-educational program is effective in improving cleaning effectiveness, and the teacher questionnaire responses support the involvement of dental hygienists as a valuable component of the program. The pattern of significant results in the PHP might suggest that more effort be made in the future to teach effective cleaning of molars.

APPENDIX A

Dental Survey Data--All Counties

DENTAL SURVEY - ALL COUNTIES - GROSS SCREENING A-1

IDENTIFICATION SECTION

	N=1488 1st Grade		N=1738 3rd Grade		N=1398 5th Grade		N=4624 Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. RACE								
Anglo	646	43.41	792	45.57	674	48.21	2112	45.67
Black	73	4.91	79	4.55	70	5.01	222	4.80
Chicano	762	51.21	859	49.42	642	45.92	2263	48.94
Other	7	0.47	8	0.46	9	0.64	24	0.52
2. PARENT WORKSHOP								
Yes	13	0.87	2	0.12	4	0.29	19	0.41
No	1475	99.13	1737	99.94	1393	99.64	4605	99.59
3. SEX								
Male	772	51.88	870	50.06	687	49.14	2329	50.37
Female	716	48.05	866	49.83	702	50.21	2283	49.37
4. GRADE								
	1488	32.18	1738	37.59	1398	30.23	4624	100.00

DENTAL SURVEY - ALL COUNTIES - GROSS SCREENING A-2

IDENTIFICATION SECTION

	N=4624 Elm. Sub-total		N=269 Jr. High-Coma]		N=178 Sr. High-Coma]		N=5071 Grand Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. RACE								
Anglo	2112	45.67	160	59.48	142	79.78	2414	47.63
Black	222	4.80	5	1.86	1	0.56	228	4.50
Chicano	2263	48.94	104	38.66	35	19.66	2402	47.40
Other	24	0.52	0	0.00	0	0.00	24	0.47
2. PARENT WORKSHOP								
Yes	19	0.41	0	0.00	0	0.00	19	0.37
No	4605	99.59	269	100.00	178	100.00	5052	99.63
3. SEX								
Male	2329	50.37	142	52.79	91	51.12	2562	50.75
Female	2283	49.37	116	43.12	87	48.88	2486	49.25
4. GRADE								
	4624	100.00	269	5.30	178	3.50	5071	100.00

DENTAL SURVEY - ALL COUNTIES - GROSS SCREENING

DENTAL HISTORY SECTION

		1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Do your teeth ache	Yes	218	14.65	247	14.21	175	12.52	640	13.84
	No	1266	85.08	1476	84.93	1222	87.41	3964	85.73
6. Are your gums sore	Yes	106	7.12	111	6.39	113	8.08	330	7.14
	No	1379	92.67	1609	92.58	1281	91.63	4269	92.32
7. Last visit to the dentist	Never	82	5.51	213	12.26	232	16.60	527	11.40
	0-6 months	127	8.53	218	12.54	260	18.60	605	13.08
	7-12 months	64	4.30	100	5.75	102	7.30	266	5.75
	13-18 months	60	4.03	134	7.71	189	13.52	383	8.28
	19 months or more	422	28.36	502	28.88	293	20.96	1217	26.32
	Yes but don't know	733	49.26	571	32.85	322	23.03	1626	35.16
8. Type of visit	Check-up	519	34.88	790	45.45	699	50.00	2008	43.43
	Fillings	219	14.72	365	21.00	394	28.18	978	21.15
	Extractions	142	9.54	227	13.06	237	16.95	606	13.11
	Orthodontic	13	0.87	28	1.61	58	4.15	99	2.14
	Other	30	2.02	55	3.16	73	5.22	158	3.42
9. Tooth brush at home	Yes	1418	95.30	1669	96.03	1372	98.14	4459	96.43
	No	68	4.57	56	3.22	25	1.79	149	3.22
10. Floss at home	Yes	321	21.57	600	34.52	670	47.93	1591	34.41
	No	1160	77.96	1124	64.67	727	52.00	3011	65.12
11. Times brush per day	None	214	14.38	177	10.18	71	5.08	462	9.99
	1	588	39.52	578	33.26	448	32.05	1614	34.90
	2	562	37.77	774	44.53	759	54.29	2095	45.31
	3	108	7.26	200	11.51	113	8.08	421	9.10
	4	9	0.60	6	0.35	6	0.43	21	0.45
	5 or more	7	0.47	3	0.17	1	0.07	11	0.24
	Average	1.42		1.59		1.67		1.56	
12. Times floss per day	None	1405	94.42	1537	88.43	1118	79.97	4060	87.80
	1	67	4.50	137	7.88	195	13.95	399	8.63
	2	12	0.81	45	2.59	73	5.22	130	2.81
	3	3	0.20	19	1.09	10	0.72	32	0.69
	4	1	0.07	0	0.00	2	0.14	3	0.06
	5 or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Average	0.07		0.16		0.27		0.17	
13. Socio-economic level	Affluent	58	3.90	64	3.68	67	4.79	189	4.09
	White collar	373	25.07	497	28.60	395	28.25	1265	27.36
	Blue collar	740	49.73	879	50.58	680	48.64	2299	49.72
	Poverty	310	20.83	300	17.26	257	18.38	867	18.75
14. Follow-up	Parent notified	1478	99.33	1721	99.02	1389	99.36	4588	99.22
	Appointment made	194	13.04	202	11.62	170	12.16	566	12.24
	Parent lacks source	144	9.68	150	8.63	100	7.15	394	8.52
	Child received	78	5.24	79	4.55	51	3.65	208	4.50
	Status unknown	1140	76.61	1349	77.62	1125	80.47	3614	78.16

DENTAL SURVEY - ALL COUNTIES - GROSS SCREENING

DENTAL HISTORY SECTION

		Elm. Sub-total		(Coma) Jr. High		(C[illegible]al) Sr. High		Grand Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Toothache	Yes	640	13.84	29	10.78	15	8.43	684	13.54
	No	3964	85.73	240	89.22	163	91.57	4367	86.46
Sores	Yes	330	7.14	10	3.72	1	0.56	341	6.76
	No	4269	92.32	258	95.91	177	99.44	4704	93.24
Dentist	Never	527	11.40	112	41.64	44	24.72	683	13.47
	0-6 months	605	13.08	58	21.56	60	33.71	723	14.26
	7-12 months	266	5.75	3	1.12	30	16.85	299	5.90
	13-18 months	383	8.28	33	12.27	16	8.99	432	8.52
	19 months or more	1217	26.32	26	9.67	24	13.48	1267	24.99
	Yes but don't know	1626	35.16	37	13.75	4	2.25	1667	32.87
Home	Check-up	2008	43.43	122	45.35	111	62.36	2241	51.54
	Fillings	978	21.15	70	26.02	61	34.27	1109	25.51
	Extractions	606	13.11	33	12.27	14	7.87	653	15.02
	Orthodontic	99	2.14	36	13.38	25	14.04	160	3.68
	Other	158	3.42	14	5.20	13	7.30	185	4.25
Home none	Yes	4459	96.43	267	99.26	177	99.44	4903	96.99
	No	149	3.22	2	0.74	1	0.56	152	3.01
Home	Yes	1591	34.41	161	59.85	127	71.35	1879	37.22
	No	3011	65.12	108	40.15	51	28.65	3170	62.78
Home	None	462	9.99	1	0.37	0	0.00	463	9.17
	1	1614	34.90	94	34.94	33	18.54	1741	34.50
	2	2095	45.31	154	57.25	110	61.80	2359	46.74
	3	421	9.10	19	7.06	26	14.61	442	8.76
	4	21	0.45	1	0.37	9	5.06	31	0.60
	5 or more	11	0.24	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	0.20
	Average	1.56		1.72		2.06		1.78	
Home	None	4060	87.80	188	69.89	126	70.79	4374	85.26
	1	399	8.63	73	27.14	43	24.16	515	10.16
	2	130	2.81	8	2.97	7	3.93	145	2.86
	3	32	0.69	0	0.00	2	1.12	34	0.70
	4	3	0.06	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.10
	5 or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Average	.17		0.33		0.35		0.28	
Level	Affluent	189	4.09	32	11.90	41	23.03	262	5.17
	White collar	1265	27.36	63	23.42	64	35.96	1392	27.46
	Blue collar	2299	49.72	136	50.56	70	39.33	2505	49.42
	Poverty	867	18.75	41	15.24	2	1.12	910	17.95
	Parent notified	4588	99.22	267	99.26	176	98.88	5031	99.21
	Appointment made	566	12.24	0	0.00	0	0.00	566	11.25
	Parent lacks source	394	8.52	0	0.00	0	0.00	394	7.83
	Child received	208	4.50	0	0.00	0	0.00	208	4.13
	Status unknown	3614	78.16	269	100.00	176	98.88	4059	80.68

DENTAL SURVEY - ALL COUNTIES - GROSS SCREENING A-6

DENTAL HEALTH SECTION

	1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. DENTAL STATUS								
Good	580	38.98	712	40.97	610	43.63	1902	41.13
Needs treatment	552	37.10	692	39.82	593	42.42	1837	39.73
Emergency	350	23.52	331	19.04	188	13.45	869	18.79
16. P.M.A.	Average rating		Average rating		Average rating		Average rating	
Papillary	1.23		[illegible]		1.28		1.25	
Marginal	0.93		[illegible]		1.01		0.96	
Attached gingiva	0.56		[illegible]		0.70		0.64	
Average	0.9[illegible]		[illegible]		1.00		0.95	
17. P.H.P.	Average score		Average score		Average score		Average score	
U.R. 1st molar	4.06		3.84		3.64		3.85	
U.R. central	3.38		3.51		3.03		3.32	
U.L. 1st molar	4.02		3.78		3.58		3.80	
L.L. 1st molar	3.29		3.16		2.92		3.13	
L.L. central	3.26		3.11		2.56		2.99	
L.R. 1st molar	3.60		3.41		3.14		3.39	
Average	3.60		3.47		3.15		3.41	

DENTAL HEALTH SECTION

	Elm. Sub-total		(Comal) Jr. High		(Comal) Sr. High		Grand Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. DENTAL STATUS								
Good	1902	41.13	175	65.06	141	79.21	2218	43.89
Needs treatment	1837	39.73	76	28.25	31	17.42	1944	38.47
Emergency	869	18.79	17	6.32	5	2.81	891	17.63
16. P.M.A.	Average rating		Average rating		Average rating		Average rating	
Papillary	1.25		0.89		0.74		1.21	
Marginal	0.96		0.67		0.52		0.93	
Attached gingiva	0.64		0.50		0.11		0.60	
Average	0.95		0.69		0.46		0.92	
17. P.H.P.	Average score		Average score		Average score		Average score	
U.R. 1st molar	3.85		2.79		2.41		3.74	
U.R. central	3.32		2.00		1.88		3.20	
U.L. 1st molar	3.80		2.70		2.39		3.69	
L.L. 1st molar	3.13		2.21		2.30		3.05	
L.L. central	2.99		1.70		1.85		2.88	
L.R. 1st molar	3.39		2.66		2.46		3.32	
Average	3.41		2.34		2.21		3.32	

APPENDIX B

Dental Survey Data by Counties

Hays County	page B-1
Guadalupe County	B-4
Medina County	B-7
Bexar County	B-10
Comal County	B-13

IDENTIFICATION SECTION

	N=478 1st Grade		N=433 3rd Grade		N=350 5th Grade		N=1261 Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. RACE								
Anglo	197	41.21	173	39.95	151	43.14	521	41.32
Black	26	5.44	24	5.54	17	4.86	67	5.31
Chicano	254	53.14	236	54.50	182	52.00	672	53.29
Other	1	0.21	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.08
2. PARENT WORKSHOP								
Yes	13	2.72	1	0.23	3	0.86	17	1.35
No	465	97.28	432	99.77	347	99.14	1244	98.65
3. SEX								
Male	251	52.51	193	44.57	181	51.71	625	49.56
Female	227	47.49	239	55.20	164	46.86	630	49.96
4. GRADE								
	478	37.91	433	34.34	350	27.76	1261	100.00

DENTAL SURVEY - HAYS COUNTY - GROSS SCREENING

DENTAL HISTORY SECTION

		1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Do your teeth ache	Yes	197	15.62	63	14.55	52	14.86	197	15.62
	No	1062	84.22	370	85.45	298	85.14	1062	84.22
6. Are your gums sore	Yes	135	10.71	45	10.39	40	11.43	135	10.71
	No	1124	89.14	388	89.61	310	88.57	1124	89.14
7. Last visit to the dentist	Never	153	12.13	65	15.01	69	19.71	153	12.13
	0-6 months	157	12.45	63	14.55	55	15.71	157	12.45
	7-12 months	49	3.89	12	2.77	30	8.57	49	3.89
	13-18 months	115	9.12	41	9.47	54	15.43	115	9.12
	19 months or more	312	24.74	104	24.02	55	15.71	312	24.74
	Yes but don't know	475	37.67	148	34.18	87	24.86	475	37.67
8. Type of visit	Check-up	451	32.77	167	38.57	151	43.14	451	35.77
	Fillings	277	21.97	101	23.33	93	26.57	277	21.97
	Extractions	173	13.72	67	15.47	64	18.29	173	13.72
	Orthodontic	25	1.98	9	2.08	16	4.57	25	1.98
	Other	40	3.17	7	1.62	17	4.86	40	3.17
9. Tooth brush @ home	Yes	1210	95.96	413	95.38	342	97.71	1210	95.96
	No	50	3.97	20	4.62	8	2.29	50	3.97
10. Floss at home	Yes	452	35.84	155	35.80	177	50.57	452	35.84
	No	803	63.68	278	64.20	173	49.43	803	63.68
11. Times brush per day	None	158	12.53	52	12.01	22	6.29	158	12.53
	1	445	35.29	134	30.95	115	32.86	445	35.29
	2	542	42.98	190	43.88	188	53.71	542	42.98
	3	113	8.96	56	12.93	25	7.14	113	8.96
	4	3	0.24	1	0.23	0	0.00	3	0.24
	5 or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Average	1.49		1.58		1.62		1.49	
12. Times floss per day	None	1074	85.17	362	83.60	275	78.57	1074	85.17
	1	120	9.52	44	10.16	44	12.58	120	9.52
	2	52	4.12	18	4.16	26	7.43	52	4.12
	3	15	1.19	9	2.08	5	1.43	15	1.19
	4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5 or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Average	0.21		0.25		0.32		0.21	
13. Socio-economic level	Affluent	52	4.12	22	5.08	17	4.86	52	4.12
	White collar	405	32.12	148	34.18	113	32.29	405	32.12
	Blue collar	440	34.89	141	32.56	124	35.43	440	34.89
	Poverty	364	28.87	123	28.41	97	27.71	364	28.87
14. Follow-up	Parent notified	1246	98.81	425	98.15	347	99.14	1246	98.81
	Appointment made	106	8.41	31	7.16	35	10.00	106	8.41
	Parent lacks source	15	1.19	3	0.69	3	0.86	15	1.19
	Child received	94	7.45	27	6.24	29	8.29	94	7.45
	Status unknown	1140	90.40	397	91.69	313	89.43	1140	90.40

DENTAL HEALTH SECTION

	1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. DENTAL STATUS								
Good	245	51.26	221	51.04	174	49.71	640	50.75
Needs treatment	163	34.10	156	36.03	137	39.14	456	36.16
Emergency	69	14.44	55	12.70	38	10.86	162	12.85
16. P.M.A.	Average rating		Average rating		Average rating		Average rating	
Papillary	0.88		0.95		0.97		0.93	
Marginal	0.81		0.96		0.97		0.90	
Attached gingiva	0.55		0.76		0.84		0.71	
Average	0.75		0.89		0.93		0.85	
17. P.H.P.	Average score		Average score		Average score		Average score	
U.R. 1st molar	3.88		3.66		3.38		3.67	
U.R. central	3.29		3.35		3.10		3.26	
U.L. 1st molar	3.80		3.63		3.38		3.62	
L.L. 1st molar	2.85		3.03		2.79		2.89	
L.L. central	3.12		2.95		2.57		2.91	
L.R. 1st molar	3.25		3.27		2.96		3.18	
Average	3.37		3.32		3.03		3.26	

DENTAL SURVEY - GUADALUPE COUNTY - GROSS SCREENING

IDENTIFICATION SECTION

	N=291 1st Grade		N=234 3rd Grade		N= 216 5th Grade		N=741 Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. RACE								
Anglo	125	42.96	118	50.43	101	46.76	344	46.42
Black	23	7.90	20	8.55	29	13.43	72	9.72
Chicano	141	48.45	96	41.03	83	38.43	320	43.18
Other	2	0.69	0	0.00	3	1.39	5	0.67
2. PARENT WORKSHOP								
Yes	0	0.00	1	0.43	1	0.46	2	0.27
No	291	100.00	234	100.00	214	99.07	739	99.73
3. SEX								
Male	140	48.11	119	50.85	112	51.85	371	50.07
Female	151	51.89	115	49.15	104	48.15	370	49.93
4. GRADE								
	291	39.27	234	31.58	216	29.15	741	100.00

DENTAL SURVEY - GUADALUPE COUNTY - GROSS SCREENING

DENTAL HISTORY SECTION

		1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Do your teeth ache	Yes	43	14.78	36	15.38	32	14.81	111	14.98
	No	247	84.88	198	84.62	184	85.19	629	84.89
6. Are your gums sore	Yes	13	4.47	5	2.14	13	6.02	31	4.18
	No	278	95.53	229	97.86	202	93.52	709	95.68
7. Last visit to the dentist	Never	40	13.75	57	24.36	37	17.13	134	18.08
	0-6 months	14	4.81	51	21.79	40	18.52	105	14.17
	7-12 months	23	7.90	19	8.12	20	9.26	62	8.37
	13-18 months	14	4.81	16	6.84	29	13.43	59	7.96
	19 months or more	76	26.12	34	14.53	42	19.44	152	20.51
	Yes but don't know	124	42.61	57	24.36	48	22.22	229	30.90
8. Type of visit	Check-up	119	40.89	100	42.74	103	47.69	322	43.45
	Fillings	47	16.15	66	28.21	73	33.80	186	25.10
	Extractions	27	9.28	27	11.54	22	10.19	76	10.26
	Orthodontic	3	1.03	4	1.71	3	1.39	10	1.35
	Other	6	2.06	13	5.56	17	7.87	36	4.86
9. Tooth-brush at home	Yes	274	94.16	226	96.58	213	98.61	713	96.22
	No	17	5.84	8	3.42	3	1.39	28	3.78
10. Floss at home	Yes	39	13.40	70	29.91	82	37.96	191	25.78
	No	252	86.60	164	70.09	134	62.04	550	74.22
11. Times brush per day	None	40	13.75	22	9.40	19	8.80	81	10.93
	1	138	47.42	82	35.04	94	43.52	314	42.38
	2	83	28.52	102	43.59	92	42.59	277	37.38
	3	21	7.22	26	11.11	11	5.09	58	7.83
	4	3	1.03	2	0.85	0	0.00	5	0.67
	5 or more	6	2.06	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	0.81
	Average	1.41		1.59		1.44		1.47	
12. Times floss per day	None	281	96.56	205	87.61	187	86.57	673	90.82
	1	9	3.09	22	9.40	22	10.19	53	7.15
	2	1	0.34	5	2.14	6	2.78	12	1.62
	3	0	0.00	2	0.85	1	0.46	3	0.40
	4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5 or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Average	0.04		0.16		0.17		0.12	
13. Socio-economic level	Affluent	27	9.28	11	4.70	11	5.09	49	6.61
	White collar	84	28.87	80	34.19	80	37.04	244	32.93
	Blue collar	125	42.96	94	40.17	83	38.43	302	40.76
	Poverty	54	18.56	49	20.94	43	19.91	146	19.70
14. Follow-up	Parent notified	289	99.31	226	96.58	216	100.00	731	98.65
	Appointment made	56	19.24	40	17.09	51	23.61	147	19.84
	Parent lacks source	30	10.31	21	8.97	13	6.02	64	8.64
	Child received	2	0.69	1	0.43	0	0.00	3	0.40
	Status unknown	195	67.01	153	65.38	154	71.30	502	67.75

DENTAL HEALTH SECTION

	1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. DENTAL STATUS								
Good	87	29.90	79	33.76	76	35.19	242	32.66
Needs treatment	147	50.52	120	51.28	112	51.85	379	51.15
Emergency	57	19.59	34	14.53	27	12.50	118	15.92
16. P.M.A.	Average rating		Average rating		Average rating		Average rating	
Papillary	1.52		1.50		1.79		1.59	
Marginal	1.13		1.18		1.40		1.22	
Attached gingiva	0.39		0.47		0.57		0.47	
Average	1.01		1.05		1.25		1.09	
17. P.H.P.	Average score		Average score		Average score		Average score	
U.R. 1st molar	4.07		4.09		3.95		4.04	
U.R. central	3.45		3.64		3.38		3.49	
U.L. 1st molar	4.05		3.99		3.90		3.99	
L.L. 1st molar	3.62		3.42		3.37		3.48	
L.L. central	3.56		3.35		3.20		3.39	
L.R. 1st molar	3.77		3.56		3.46		3.61	
Average	3.75		3.68		3.54		3.67	

IDENTIFICATION SECTION

	N=390 1st Grade		N=402 3rd Grade		N=331 5th Grade		N=1123 Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. RACE								
Anglo	171	43.85	167	41.54	158	47.73	496	44.17
Black	1	0.26	2	0.50	0	0.00	3	0.27
Chicano	218	55.90	232	57.71	170	51.36	620	55.21
Other	0	0.00	1	0.25	0	0.00	1	0.09
2. PARENT WORKSHOP								
Yes	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
No	390	100.00	402	100.00	331	100.00	1123	100.00
3. SEX								
Male	208	53.33	212	52.74	155	46.83	575	51.20
Female	181	46.41	190	47.26	176	53.17	547	48.71
4. GRADE								
	390	34.73	402	35.80	331	29.47	1123	100.00

DENTAL SURVEY - MEDINA COUNTY - GROSS SCREENING

DENTAL HISTORY SECTION

		1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Do your teeth ache	Yes	46	11.79	67	16.67	50	15.11	163	14.51
	No	343	87.95	335	83.33	281	84.89	959	85.40
6. Are your gums sore	Yes	20	5.13	23	5.72	29	8.76	72	6.41
	No	369	94.62	379	94.28	302	91.24	1050	93.50
7. Last visit to the dentist	Never	19	4.87	31	7.71	28	8.46	78	6.95
	0-6 months	34	8.72	22	5.47	54	16.31	110	9.80
	7-12 months	13	3.33	20	4.98	27	8.16	60	5.34
	13-18 months	26	6.67	46	11.44	49	14.80	121	10.77
	19 months or more	85	21.79	115	28.61	88	26.59	288	25.65
	Yes but don't know	213	54.62	168	41.79	85	25.68	466	41.50
8. Type of visit	Check-up	103	26.41	139	34.58	129	38.97	371	33.04
	Fillings	45	11.54	63	15.67	88	26.59	196	17.45
	Extractions	41	10.51	52	12.94	64	19.34	157	13.98
	Orthodontic	9	2.31	8	1.99	9	2.72	26	2.32
	Other	7	1.79	11	2.74	4	1.21	22	1.96
9. Tooth brush at home	Yes	376	96.41	388	96.52	321	96.98	1085	96.62
	No	13	3.33	14	3.48	10	3.02	37	3.29
10. Floss at home	Yes	76	19.49	131	32.59	144	43.50	351	31.26
	No	313	80.26	270	67.16	187	56.50	770	68.57
11. Times brush per day	None	43	11.03	23	5.72	12	3.63	78	6.95
	1	163	41.79	144	35.82	106	32.02	413	36.78
	2	169	43.33	208	51.74	191	57.70	568	50.58
	3	13	3.33	25	6.22	20	6.04	58	5.16
	4	2	0.51	0	0.00	2	0.60	4	0.36
	5 or more	0	0.00	2	0.50	0	0.00	2	0.18
	Average	1.41		1.60		1.68		1.56	
12. Times floss per day	None	375	96.15	370	92.04	292	88.22	1037	92.34
	1	11	2.82	24	5.97	28	8.46	63	5.61
	2	3	0.77	7	1.74	10	3.02	20	1.78
	3	1	0.26	1	0.25	0	0.00	2	0.18
	4	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.30	1	0.09
	5 or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Average	0.05		0.10		0.16		0.10	
13. Socio-economic level	Affluent	11	2.82	20	4.98	7	2.11	38	3.38
	White collar	80	20.51	64	15.92	79	23.87	223	19.84
	Blue collar	228	58.46	253	62.94	199	60.12	680	60.55
	Poverty	70	17.95	66	16.42	44	13.29	180	16.03
14. Follow-up	Parent notified	387	99.23	401	99.75	326	98.49	1114	99.20
	Appointment made	54	13.85	76	18.91	47	14.20	177	15.76
	Parent lacks source	31	7.95	43	10.70	30	9.06	104	9.26
	Child received	35	8.97	35	8.71	17	5.14	87	7.75
	Status unknown	303	77.69	266	66.17	246	74.32	815	72.57

DENTAL SURVEY - MEDINA COUNTY - GROSS SCREENING

DENTAL HEALTH SECTION

	1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. DENTAL STATUS								
Good	117	30.00	111	27.61	113	34.14	341	30.37
Needs treatment	109	27.95	148	36.82	148	44.71	405	36.06
Emergency	161	41.28	143	35.57	67	20.24	371	33.04
16. P.M.A.	Average rating		Average rating		Average rating		Average rating	
Papillary	1.34		1.57		1.58		1.49	
Marginal	1.02		1.16		1.25		1.14	
Attached gingiva	0.79		0.96		1.08		0.94	
Average	1.05		1.23		1.31		1.19	
17. P.H.P.	Average score		Average score		Average score		Average score	
U.R. 1st molar	4.40		4.29		4.15		4.29	
U.R. central	3.63		3.91		3.46		3.68	
U.L. 1st molar	4.38		4.25		4.20		4.28	
L.L. 1st molar	3.49		3.18		3.19		3.29	
L.L. central	3.28		3.22		2.74		3.10	
L.R. 1st molar	3.87		3.61		3.46		3.66	
Average	3.84		3.74		3.53		3.72	

DENTAL SURVEY - BEXAR COUNTY - GROSS SCREENING

IDENTIFICATION SECTION

	N=327 1st Grade		N=280 3rd Grade		N=260 5th Grade		N=867 Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. RACE								
Anglo	151	46.18	124	44.29	131	50.38	406	46.83
Black	23	7.03	25	8.93	20	7.69	68	7.84
Chicano	149	45.57	124	44.29	103	39.62	376	43.37
Other	4	1.22	7	2.50	6	2.31	17	1.96
2. PARENT WORKSHOP								
Yes	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
No	327	100.00	280	100.00	260	100.00	867	100.00
3. SEX								
Male	172	52.60	146	52.14	122	46.92	440	50.75
Female	155	47.40	134	47.86	138	53.08	427	49.25
4. GRADE								
	327	37.72	280	32.30	260	29.99	867	100.00

DENTAL SURVEY - BEXAR COUNTY - GROSS SCREENING

DENTAL HISTORY SECTION

		1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Do your teeth ache	Yes	47	14.37	40	14.29	18	6.92	105	12.11
	No	280	85.63	238	85.00	242	93.08	760	87.66
6. Are your gums sore	Yes	23	7.03	20	7.14	22	8.46	65	7.50
	No	304	92.97	257	91.79	237	91.15	798	92.04
7. Last visit to the dentist	Never	4	1.22	6	2.14	16	6.15	26	3.00
	0-6 months	40	12.23	28	10.00	44	16.92	112	12.92
	7-12 months	21	6.42	34	12.14	21	8.08	76	8.77
	13-18 months	0	0.00	4	1.43	21	8.08	25	2.88
	19 months or more	108	33.03	135	48.21	98	37.69	341	39.33
	Yes but don't know	154	47.09	73	26.07	60	23.08	287	33.10
8. Type of visit	Check-up	164	50.15	202	72.14	195	75.00	561	64.71
	Fillings	44	13.46	63	22.50	77	29.62	184	21.22
	Extractions	32	9.79	48	17.14	46	17.69	126	14.53
	Orthodontic	1	0.31	2	0.71	3	1.15	6	0.69
	Other	1	0.31	0	0.00	1	0.38	2	0.23
9. Tooth-brush at home	Yes	311	95.11	271	96.79	258	99.23	840	96.89
	No	16	4.89	9	3.21	2	0.77	27	3.11
10. Floss at home	Yes	85	25.99	123	43.93	123	47.31	331	38.18
	No	242	74.01	157	56.07	137	52.69	536	61.82
11. Times brush per day	None	47	14.37	24	8.57	10	3.85	81	9.34
	1	90	27.52	85	30.36	74	28.46	249	28.72
	2	145	44.34	103	36.79	155	59.62	403	46.48
	3	42	12.84	68	24.29	19	7.31	129	14.88
	4	2	0.61	0	0.00	1	0.38	3	0.35
	5 or more	1	0.31	0	0.00	1	0.38	2	0.23
	Average	1.59		1.77		1.73		1.69	
12. Times floss per day	None	311	95.11	238	85.00	203	78.08	752	86.74
	1	14	4.28	30	10.71	44	16.92	88	10.15
	2	0	0.00	7	2.50	10	3.85	17	1.96
	3	1	0.31	5	1.79	2	0.77	8	0.92
	4	1	0.31	0	0.00	1	0.38	2	0.23
	5 or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Average	0.06		0.21		0.28		0.18	
13. Socio-economic level	Affluent	7	2.14	4	1.43	5	1.92	16	1.85
	White collar	63	19.27	46	16.43	66	25.38	175	20.18
	Blue collar	212	64.83	192	68.57	162	62.31	566	65.28
	Poverty	42	12.84	38	13.58	29	11.15	109	12.57
14. Follow-up	Parent notified	326	99.69	280	100.00	259	99.62	865	99.77
	Appointment made	43	13.15	40	14.29	37	14.23	120	13.84
	Parent lacks source	74	22.63	73	26.07	54	20.77	201	23.18
	Child received	2	0.61	4	1.43	5	1.92	11	1.27
	Status unknown	211	64.53	169	60.36	171	65.77	551	63.55

DENTAL HEALTH SECTION

	1st Grade		3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. DENTAL STATUS								
Good	130	39.76	83	29.64	78	30.00	291	33.56
Needs treatment	132	40.37	151	53.93	145	55.77	428	49.37
Emergency	63	19.27	45	16.07	36	13.85	144	16.61
16. P.M.A.	Average rating		Average rating		Average rating		Average rating	
Papillary	1.32		1.39		1.42		1.37	
Marginal	0.80		0.86		1.02		0.89	
Attached gingiva	0.44		0.47		0.57		0.49	
Average	0.86		0.91		1.00		0.92	
17. P.H.P.	Average score		Average score		Average score		Average score	
U.R. 1st molar	3.93		3.99		3.83		3.92	
U.R. central	3.11		3.42		2.97		3.17	
U.L. 1st molar	3.88		3.79		3.49		3.73	
L.L. 1st molar	3.42		3.34		3.02		3.27	
L.L. central	3.16		3.18		2.59		3.00	
L.R. 1st molar	3.63		3.70		3.34		3.57	
Average	3.52		3.57		3.21		3.44	

DENTAL SURVEY - COMAL COUNTY - GROSS SCREENING

IDENTIFICATION SECTION

	N=* 1st Grade		N=389 3rd Grade		N=241 5th Grade		N=630 Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. RACE								
Anglo			210	53.98	133	55.19	345	54.99
Black			8	2.06	4	1.66	12	1.90
Chicano			171	43.96	104	43.15	275	43.51
Other			0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2. PARENT WORKSHOP								
Yes			0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
No			389	100.00	241	100.00	632	100.00
3. SEX								
Male			200	51.41	117	48.55	318	50.32
Female			188	48.33	120	49.79	309	48.89
4. GRADE								
			389	61.55	241	38.13	630	100.00

There were no 1st graders available for the study, so 2nd and 3rd grade students were evaluated instead. However, since these students were near the end of their school year, results were included in the 3rd grade totals only.

IDENTIFICATION SECTION

	N=630 Elm. Sub-total		N=269 Jr. High		N=178 Sr. High		N=1077	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. RACE								
Anglo	345	54.99	160	59.48	142	79.78	647	60.07
Black	12	1.90	5	1.86	1	0.56	18	1.67
Chicano	275	43.51	104	38.66	35	19.66	414	38.44
Other	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2. PARENT WORKSHOP								
Yes	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
No	63	100.00	269	100.00	178	100.00	1077	100.00
3. SEX								
Male	318	50.32	142	52.79	91	51.12	551	51.16
Female	309	48.89	116	43.12	87	48.88	512	47.54
4. GRADE								
	630	100.00	269	5.30	178	3.50	1077	100.00

DENTAL HISTORY SECTION

				3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Do your teeth ache	Yes			41	10.54	23	9.54	64	10.13
	No			335	86.12	217	90.04	554	87.66
6. Are your gums sore	Yes			18	4.63	9	3.73	27	4.27
	No			356	91.52	230	95.44	588	93.04
7. Last visit to the dentist	Never			54	13.88	82	34.02	136	21.52
	0-6 months			54	13.88	67	27.80	121	19.15
	7-12 months			15	3.86	4	1.66	19	3.01
	13-18 months			27	6.94	36	14.94	63	9.97
	19 months or more			114	29.31	10	4.15	124	19.62
	Yes but don't know			125	32.13	42	17.43	169	26.74
8. Type of visit	Check-up			182	46.79	121	50.21	303	47.94
	Fillings			72	18.51	63	26.14	135	21.36
	Extractions			33	8.48	41	17.01	74	11.71
	Orthodontic			5	1.29	27	11.20	32	5.06
	Other			24	6.17	34	14.11	58	9.18
9. Tooth-brush @ home	Yes			371	95.37	238	98.76	611	96.68
	No			5	1.29	2	0.83	7	1.11
10. Floss at home	Yes			121	31.11	144	59.75	266	42.09
	No			255	65.55	96	39.83	352	55.70
11. Times brush per day	None			56	14.40	8	3.32	64	10.13
	1			133	34.19	59	24.48	193	30.54
	2			171	43.96	133	55.19	305	48.26
	3			25	6.43	38	15.77	63	9.97
	4			3	0.77	3	1.24	6	0.95
	5 or more			1	0.26	0	0.00	1	0.16
	Average			1.46		1.87		1.62	
12. Times floss per day	None			362	93.06	161	66.80	524	82.91
	1			17	4.37	57	23.65	75	11.87
	2			8	2.06	21	8.71	29	4.59
	3			2	0.51	2	0.83	4	0.63
	4			0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5 or more			0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Average			0.10		0.44		0.23	
13. Socio-economic level	Affluent			7	1.80	27	11.20	34	5.38
	White collar			159	40.87	57	23.65	218	34.49
	Blue collar			199	51.16	112	46.47	311	49.21
	Poverty			24	6.17	44	18.26	68	10.76
14. Follow-up	Parent notified			389	100.00	241	100.00	632	100.00
	Appointment made			15	3.86	0	0.00	16	2.53
	Parent lacks source			10	2.57	0	0.00	10	1.58
	Child received			12	3.08	0	0.00	13	2.06
	Status unknown			364	93.57	241	100.00	606	95.89

DENTAL SURVEY - COMAL COUNTY - GROSS SCREENING

DENTAL HISTORY SECTION

		Elm. Sub-total		Jr. High		Sr. High		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Do your teeth ache	Yes	64	10.13	29	10.78	15	8.43	108	10.03
	No	554	87.66	240	89.22	163	91.57	957	88.86
6. Are your gums sore	Yes	27	4.27	10	3.72	1	0.56	38	3.53
	No	588	93.04	258	95.91	177	99.44	1023	94.99
7. Last visit to the dentist	Never	136	21.52	112	41.64	44	24.72	292	27.11
	0-6 months	121	19.15	58	21.56	60	33.71	239	22.19
	7-12 months	19	3.01	3	1.12	30	16.85	52	4.83
	13-18 months	63	9.97	33	12.27	16	8.99	112	10.40
	19 months or more	124	19.62	26	9.67	24	13.48	174	16.16
	Yes but don't know	169	26.74	37	13.75	4	2.25	210	19.50
8. Type of visit	Check-up	303	47.94	122	45.35	111	62.36	536	49.77
	Fillings	135	21.36	70	26.02	61	34.27	266	24.70
	Extractions	74	11.71	33	12.27	14	7.87	121	11.23
	Orthodontic	32	5.06	36	13.38	25	14.04	93	8.64
	Other	58	9.18	14	5.20	13	7.30	85	7.89
9. Tooth-brush at home	Yes	611	96.68	267	99.26	177	99.44	1055	97.96
	No	7	1.11	2	0.74	1	0.56	10	0.92
10. Floss at home	Yes	266	42.09	161	59.85	127	71.35	554	51.44
	No	352	55.70	108	40.15	51	28.65	511	47.45
11. Times brush per day	None	64	10.13	1	0.37	0	0.00	65	6.04
	1	193	30.54	94	34.94	33	18.54	320	29.71
	2	305	48.26	154	57.25	110	61.80	569	52.83
	3	63	9.97	19	7.06	26	14.61	108	10.03
	4	6	0.95	1	0.37	9	5.06	16	1.49
	5 or more	1	0.16	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.09
	Average	1.62		1.72		2.06		1.72	
12. Times floss per day	None	524	82.91	188	69.89	126	70.79	838	77.81
	1	75	11.87	73	27.14	43	24.16	191	17.73
	2	29	4.59	8	2.97	7	3.93	44	4.09
	3	4	0.63	0	0.00	2	1.12	6	0.56
	4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	5 or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Average	0.23		0.33		0.35		0.27	
13. Socio-economic level	Affluent	34	5.38	32	11.90	41	23.03	107	9.94
	White collar	218	34.49	63	23.42	64	35.96	345	32.03
	Blue collar	311	49.21	136	50.56	70	39.33	517	48.00
	Poverty	68	10.76	41	15.24	2	1.12	111	10.31
14. Follow-up	Parent notified	632	100.00	267	99.26	176	98.88	1075	99.81
	Appointment made	16	2.53	0	0.00	0	0.00	16	1.49
	Parent lacks source	10	1.58	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	0.92
	Child received	13	2.06	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	1.21
	Status unknown	606	95.89	269	100.00	176	98.88	1051	97.59

DENTAL HEALTH SECTION

	3rd Grade		5th Grade		Elm. Sub-total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. DENTAL STATUS						
Good			218	56.04	169	70.12	388	61.39
Needs treatment			117	30.08	51	21.16	169	26.74
Emergency			54	13.88	20	8.30	74	11.71
16. P.M.A.	Average rating		Average rating		Average rating		Average rating	
Papillary			0.99		0.71		0.90	
Marginal			0.63		0.36		0.54	
Attached gingiva			0.42		0.22		0.36	
Average			0.68		0.43		0.60	
17. P.H.P.	Average score		Average score		Average score		Average score	
U.R. 1st molar			3.33		2.86		3.15	
U.R. central			3.26		2.10		2.83	
U.L. 1st molar			3.35		2.83		3.15	
L.L. 1st molar			3.00		2.24		2.71	
L.L. central			2.98		1.65		2.48	
L.R. 1st molar			3.07		2.48		2.85	
Average			3.17		2.36		2.86	

DENTAL HEALTH SECTION

	Elm. Sub-total		Jr. High		Sr. High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. DENTAL STATUS								
Good	388	61.39	175	65.06	141	79.21	704	65.37
Needs treatment	169	26.74	76	28.25	31	17.42	276	25.63
Emergency	74	11.71	17	6.32	5	2.81	96	8.91
16. P.M.A.	Average rating		Average rating		Average rating		Average rating	
Papillary	0.90		0.89		0.74		0.87	
Marginal	0.54		0.67		0.52		0.62	
Attached gingiva	0.36		0.50		0.11		0.35	
Average	0.60		0.69		0.46		0.60	
17. P.H.P.	Average score		Average score		Average score		Average score	
U.R. 1st molar	3.15		2.79		2.41		2.93	
U.R. central	2.83		2.00		1.88		2.47	
U.L. 1st molar	3.15		2.70		2.39		2.47	
L.L. 1st molar	2.71		2.21		2.30		2.52	
L.L. central	2.48		1.70		1.85		2.18	
L.R. 1st molar	2.85		2.66		2.46		2.74	
Average	2.86		2.34		2.21		2.62	

APPENDIX C

Teacher Evaluation Results

Totals by School Districts

Totals by all Districts

We would appreciate your help in our efforts to continually upgrade the Tattle Tooth Program. Please complete this questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to the Bureau of Dental Health, Texas Department of Health.

Thank you,

We need to hear from you!

TOTALS (BY SCHOOL DISTRICT)

Please check the appropriate answer.

Grade _____

1. Describe the dental problems in your class.

Lackland	Southwest	South San Antonio	Southside	Somerset	
0	11(34.4)	26(32.1)	5(50)	4(31.1)	widespread and severe
5(62.5)	19(59.4)	52(64.2)	5(50)	8(66.7)	about normal
3(37.5)	0	0	0	0	rare
0	0	0	0	0	non-existent
0	2(6.2)	3(3.7)	0	0	don't know

2. How would you rate the changes in dental health that the Tattle Tooth Program has made in your class?

0	4(13.3)	18(22.8)	0	2(16.7)	drastic improvements
8(100)	24(80)	61(77.2)	9(90)	8(66.7)	slight changes
0	2(6.7)	0	1(10)	2(16.7)	no changes whatsoever
0	0	0	0	0	negative changes--things are worse than before

3. Which of the following most accurately sums up your feelings about the program?

5(62.5)	22(68.75)	63(81.8)	7(70)	8(80)	The program was well-conceived and put toget.
0	6(18.75)	9(11.7)	1(10)	1(10)	The program needed bett logistical planning.
3(37.5)	4(12.5)	5(6.5)	2(20)	1(10)	The educational part of program should have bee better planned.
0	0	0	0	0	The program was poorly together.

4. Were you generally satisfied with the in-service training?

7(100)	29(93.5)	67(81.7)	8(80)	11(100)	Yes
0	2(6.5)	15(18.3)	2(20)	0	No

5. The dental-technical portion of the training was

5(62.5)	26(86.7)	68(86.1)	9(90)	10(100)	realistic and sufficien
3(37.5)	4(13.3)	11(13.9)	1(10)	0	too sketchy.
0	0	0	0	0	not understandable.
0	0	0	0	0	misleading.

6. The educational component of the training was

7(100)	21(70)	61(79.2)	9(90)	8(80)	realistic and sufficien
0	(930)	14(18.2)	1(10)	2(20)	too sketchy.
0	0	0	0	0	not understandable.
0	0	2(2.6)	0	0	misleading.

Lackland	Southwest	South San Antonio	Southside	Somerset	
7. Which of the following would be the closest to your feelings about the dental hygienist's assistance when she was in your school.					
8(100)	24(80)	74(90.2)	10(100)	11(100)	I found her help generally useful
0	2(6.7)	0	0	0	She was unavailable when I needed
0	3(10)	1(1.2)	0	0	She was not very helpful.
0	1(3.3)	7(8.5)	0	0	Her assistance was unnecessary.
8. Which of the following is the most accurate appraisal of the dental hygienist's approach in demonstrating brushing and flossing.					
6(66.7)	22(71)	71(87.6)	9(90)	10(90.9)	She was very organized and clear
3(33.3)	8(25.8)	8(9.9)	1(10)	1(9.1)	She was generally understandable needed better organization.
0	1(3.2)	2(2.5)	0	0	She presented information poorly was hard to understand.
9. Which of the following most accurately describes the reactions of your students to the brushing and flossing program by the dental hygienist.					
6(66.7)	17(54.8)	49(59.7)	4(40)	4(36.4)	Enthusiasm and motivation
3(33.3)	12(38.7)	25(30.5)	4(40)	6(54.5)	Moderate enthusiasm
0	2(6.5)	5(6.1)	2(20)	1(9.1)	Mildly interested
0	0	3(3.7)	0	0	Did not seem impressed or motiva
10. Do you feel that you would have been as successful in teaching brushing and flossing without the hygienist's help?					
4(50)	7(22.6)	26(32.9)	0	4(36.4)	yes
4(50)	24(77.4)	53(67.1)	9(100)	7(63.6)	no
11. How often would you like a hygienist to assist you in teaching brushing and flossing?					
3(37.5)	3(10)	6(7.9)	0	2(18.2)	not again
5(62.5)	24(80)	66(86.8)	10(100)	6(54.5)	once a year
0	3(10)	3(3.9)	0	3(27.3)	once every two years
0	0	1(1.3)	0	0	once every three years.
12. How many time during the program did your students brush and/or floss in the classroom?					
8(100)	16(51.6)	39(51.3)	3(33.3)	10(90.9)	everyday
0	0	0	1(11.1)	0	2x week
0	0	4(5.3)	2(22.2)	0	3x week
0	3(9.7)	7(9.2)	2(22.2)	1(9.1)	1-3x week
0	8(25.8)	10(13.2)	1(11.1)	0	4-6x
0	0	5(6.6)	0	0	7-10x
0	4(12.9)	11(14.5)	0	0	more than 10x
13. How many of the Tattle Tooth lessons did you teach?					
0	0	0	0	3(27.3)	zero
0	0	1(1.3)	0	0	1-2
2(25)	1(3.6)	10(13.3)	5(50)	4(36.4)	3-4
0	5(17.9)	16(21.3)	0	0	5-6
1(12.5)	9(32.1)	9(12.0)	3(30)	0	7-8
5(62.5)	13(46.4)	39(52.0)	2(20)	4(36.4)	9-10

Is there something you would like to tell us about the program?

SCHOOL _____ CITY _____

We would appreciate your help in our efforts to continually upgrade the Tattle Tooth Program. Please complete this questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to the Bureau of Dental Health Texas Department of Health.

Thank you.

We need to hear from you!

TOTALS (BY SCHOOL DISTRICT CONT

Please check the appropriate answer.

Grade _____

1. Describe the dental problems in your class.

Sedalia Valley	Hondo	San Marcos	New Braunfels	Dripping Springs	
3(23.1)	5(45.5)	2(5.6)	7(29.2)	0	widespread and severe
10(76.9)	6(54,5)	23(91.7)	15(62.5)	9(90)	about normal
0	0	0	1(4.2)	1(10)	rare
0	0	0	0	0	non-existent
0	0	1(2.7)	1(4.2)	0	don't know

2. How would you rate the changes in dental health that the Tattle Tooth Program has made in your class?

4(30.8)	1(9.1)	3(9.4)	1(4.2)	2(20)	drastic improvements
9(69.2)	9(81.8)	26(81.3)	22(91.7)	8(80)	slight changes
0	1(9.1)	3(9.4)	1(4.2)	0	no changes whatsoever
0	0	0	0	0	negative changes--thin are worse than before

3. Which of the following most accurately sums up your feelings about the program?

10(76.9)	3(37.5)	15(45.5)	9(37.5)	8(8.9)	The program was well-conceived and put toget
1(7.9)	2(2.5)	4(12.1)	6(25.0)	0	The program needed bett logistical planning.
1(7.7)	0	10(30.3)	7(29.2)	1(1.1)	The educational part of program should have bee better planned.
1(7.7)	3(37.5)	1(3.0)	2(8.3)	0	The program was poorly together.

3(9.1)no answer

4. Were you generally satisfied with the in-service training?

11(84.6)	8(72.7)	23(69.7)	19(90.5)	10(100)	Yes
2(15.4)	3(27.3)	10(30.3)	2(9.5)	0	No

5. The dental-technical portion of the training was

10(76.9)	8(72.7)	21(72.4)	19(86.4)	9(100)	realistic and sufficien
2(15.4)	2(18.2)	4(13.8)	2(9.1)	0	too sketchy.
0	0	3(10.3)	0	0	not understandable.
1(7.7)	1(9.1)	1(3.4)	1(4.5)	0	misleading.

6. The educational component of the training was

10(76.9)	7(63.6)	14(53.9)	15(68.2)	9(90)	realistic and sufficien
3(23.1)	3(27.3)	7(26.9)	5(22.7)	1(10)	too sketchy.
0	1(9.1)	4(15.4)	2(9.1)	0	not understandable.
0	0	1(3.8)	0	0	misleading.

Medina Valley	Hondo	San Marcos	New Braunfels	Dripping Springs	
7. Which of the following would be the closest to your feelings about the dental hygienist's assistance when she was in your school.					
13(100)	6(66.7)	25(73.5)	20	10	I found her help generally usefu
0	2(27.3)	1(2.9)	0	0	She was unavailable when I needed
0	0	1(2.9)	0	0	She was not very helpful.
0	1(11.1)	7(20.6)	3	0	Her assistance was unnecessary.
8. Which of the following is the most accurate appraisal of the dental hygienist's approach in demonstrating brushing and flossing.					
11(84.6)	3(30)	25	19	9	She was very organized and clear
2(15.4)	6(60)	6	5	1	She was generally understandable needed better organization.
0	1(10)	0	0	0	She presented information poorly was hard to understand.
9. Which of the following most accurately describes the reactions of your students to the brushing and flossing program by the dental hygienist.					
8(61.5)	2(18.2)	13(39.4)	9	4	Enthusiasm and motivation
3(23.1)	7(63.6)	11(33.3)	12	5	Moderate enthusiasm
2(15.4)	1(9.1)	8(24.2)	1	1	Mildly interested
0	1(9.1)	1(3.0)	0	0	Did not seem impressed or motiva
10. Do you feel that you would have been as successful in teaching brushing and flossing without the hygienist's help?					
3(23.1)	4(36.4)	19	16	2	yes
10(76.9)	7(63.6)	33	13	8	no
11. How often would you like a hygienist to assist you in teaching brushing and flossing?					
1(7.7)	3(30)	4	6	0	not again
11(84.6)	4(40)	25	15	9	once a year
0	0	0	1	0	once every two years
1(7.7)	3(30)	2	0	1	once every three years.
12. How many times during the program did your students brush and/or floss in the classroom?					
9(69.2)	2(20	17(56.7)	6(30.0)	6(67.0)	everyday
0	0	0	3(15.0)	0	2x week
0	0	1(3.3)	0	1(11.0)	3x week
0	0	0	7(35.0)	1(11.0)	1-3x
3(23.1)	7(70)	7(23.3)	2(10.0)	0	4-6x
0	0	1(3.3)	1(5.0)	0	7-10x
1(7.7)	1(10)	4(13.3)	1(5.0)	1(11.0)	more than 10x
13. How many of the Tattle Tooth lessons did you teach?					
0	2(18.2)	0	0	0	zero
0	2(18.2)	4(13.3)	2(11.1)	0	1-2
1(8.3)	0	3(10.0)	4(22.2)	0	3-4
4(33.3)	1(9.1)	4(13.3)	4(22.2)	0	5-6
2(16.7)	0	1(3.3)	1(5.6)	3(30.0)	7-8
5(41.7)	6(54.6)	18(60.0)	7(38.9)	7(70.0)	9-10

Is there something you would like to tell us about the program?

_____

_____

_____

SCHOOL _____ CITY _____

We need to hear from you!

We would appreciate your help in our efforts to continually upgrade the Tattle Tooth Program. Please complete this questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to the Bureau of Dental Health, Texas Department of Health.

Thank you,

TOTAL (ALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS)

Please check the appropriate answer.

Grade _____

1. Describe the dental problems in your class.

Natalia-Devine	Hays	TOTAL	
6(40)	2(18.2)	71(28.1)	widespread and severe
9(60)	8(72.7)	169(66.8)	about normal
0	1(9.1)	6(2.4)	rare
0	0	0	non-existent
0	0	7(2.8)	don't know

2. How would you rate the changes in dental health that the Tattle Tooth Program has made in your class?

7(41.2)	0	42(16.1)	drastic improvements
9(52.9)	11(100)	204(79.4)	slight changes
1(5.9)	0	11(4.3)	no changes whatsoever
0	0	0	negative changes--things are worse than before

3. Which of the following most accurately sums up your feelings about the program?

9(60)	6(54.5)	157(63.7)	The program was well-conceived and put toget
3(17.6)	0	33(11.8)	The program needed bett logistical planning.
3(17.6)	4(36.4)	41(17.2)	The educational part of program should have bee better planned.
0	1(9.1)	8(3.1)	The program was poorly together.

4. Were you generally satisfied with the in-service training?

14(100)	8(72.7)	215(84.6)	Yes
0	3(27.3)	39(15.4)	No

5. The dental-technical portion of the training was

11(73.3)	7(33.6)	213(82.9)	realistic and sufficien
4(26.7)	4(36.4)	37(14.4)	too sketchy.
0	0	3(1.2)	not understandable.
0	0	4(1.6)	misleading.

6. The educational component of the training was

11(73.3)	7(63.6)	179(66.5)	realistic and sufficien
4(26.7)	4(36.4)	80(29.7)	too sketchy.
0	0	7(2.7)	not understandable.
0	0	3(1.2)	misleading.

	Natalia-Devine	Hays	TOTAL	
7. Which of the following would be the closest to your feelings about the dental hygienist's assistance when she was in your school.				
	14(93.3)	9(81.8)	224(87.5)	I found her help generally useful
	1(6.7)	0	6(2.3)	She was unavailable when I needed
	0	0	5(2.0)	She was not very helpful.
	0	2(18.2)	21(8.2)	Her assistance was unnecessary.
8. Which of the following is the most accurate appraisal of the dental hygienist's approach in demonstrating brushing and flossing.				
	10(67)	9(81.8)	204(79.7)	She was very organized and clear
	5(33)	2(18.2)	48(18.75)	She was generally understandable needed better organization.
	0	0	4(1.6)	She presented information poorly was hard to understand.
9. Which of the following most accurately describes the reactions of your students to the brushing and flossing program by the dental hygienist.				
	8(53.3)	3(27.3)	127(49.2)	Enthusiasm and motivation
	6(40)	4(36.4)	98(38.0)	Moderate enthusiasm
	1(6.7)	4(36.4)	28(10.9)	Mildly interested
	0	0	5(2.0)	Did not seem impressed or motiva
10. Do you feel that you would have been as successful in teaching brushing and flossing without the hygienist's help?				
	1(7.1)	5(54.5)	92(33.1)	yes
	13(92.9)	5(45.5)	186(66.9)	no
11. How often would you like a hygienist to assist you in teaching brushing and flossing?				
	1(6.7)	3(27.3)	32(12.2)	not again
	12(80)	8(72.7)	210(79.8)	once a year
	2(13.3)	1(9.1)	13(5.0)	once every two years
	0	0	8(3.0)	once every three years.
12. How many times during the program did your students brush and/or floss in the classroom.				
	14(9303)	5(45.5)	135(51.7)	everyday
	0	0	14(5.4)	2x week
	0	0	16(6.1)	3x week
	0	2(18.2)	23(8.8)	1-3x
	0	3(27.3)	41(15.7)	4-6x
	0	0	>(2.7)	7-10x
	1(6.7)	1(9.1)	25(9.6)	more than 10x
13. How many of the Tuttle Tooth lessons did you teach? _____				
	1(7.7)	0	6(2.5)	zero
	0	1(10)	10(4.1)	1-2
	1(7.7)	1(10)	32(13.2)	3-4
	1(7.7)	1(10)	36(14.8)	5-6
	1(7.7)	2(20)	32(13.2)	7-8
	9(69.2)	5(50)	127(52.3)	9-10

Is there something you would like to tell us about the program?

_____

_____

_____

SCHOOL _____ _____ CITY _____

APPENDIX C

Teacher Evaluation Results

Totals by School Districts

Totals of all Districts

We would appreciate your help in our efforts to continually upgrade the Tattle Tooth Program. Please complete this questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to the Bureau of Dental Health, Texas Department of Health..

Thank you,

We need to hear from you!

TOTAL (ALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS)

Please check the appropriate answer.

Grade _____

1. Describe the dental problems in your class.

Natalie-Devine	Hays	TOTAL	
6(40)	2(18.2)	71(28.1)	widespread and severe
9(60)	8(72.7)	169(66.8)	about normal
0	1(9.1)	6(2.4)	rare
0	0	0	non-existent
0	0	7(2.8)	don't know

2. How would you rate the changes in dental health that the Tattle Tooth Program has made in your class?

7(41.2)	0	42(16.3)	drastic improvements
9(52.9)	11(100)	204(79.4)	slight changes
1(5.9)	0	11(4.3)	no changes whatsoever
0	0	0	negative changes--things are worse than before

3. Which of the following most accurately sums up your feelings about the program?

9(60)	6(54.5)	157(63.7)	The program was well-conceived and put together.
3(17.6)	0	33(13.8)	The program needed better logistical planning.
3(17.6)	4(36.4)	41(17.2)	The educational part of the program should have been better planned.
0	1(9.1)	8(3.3)	The program was poorly put together.

4. Were you generally satisfied with the in-service training?

14(100)	8(72.7)	215(84.6)	Yes
0	3(27.3)	39(15.4)	No

5. The dental-technical portion of the training was

11(73.3)	7(33.6)	213(82.9)	realistic and sufficient.
4(26.7)	4(36.4)	37(14.4)	too sketchy.
0	0	3(1.2)	not understandable.
0	0	4(1.6)	misleading.

6. The educational component of the training was

11(73.3)	7(63.6)	178(66.5)	realistic and sufficient.
4(26.7)	4(36.4)	80(28.7)	too sketchy.
0	0	7(2.7)	not understandable.
0	0	3(1.1)	misleading.

7. Which of the following would be the closest to your feelings about the dental hygienist's assistance when she was in your school.

14(93.3)	9(81.8)	224(87.5)	I found her help generally useful.
1(6.7)	0	6(2.3)	She was unavailable when I needed her
0	0	5(2.0)	She was not very helpful.
0	2(18.2)	21(8.2)	Her assistance was unnecessary.

8. Which of the following is the most accurate appraisal of the dental hygienist's approach in demonstrating brushing and flossing.

10(67)	9(81.8)	204(79.7)	She was very organized and clear.
5(33)	2(18.2)	48(18.75)	She was generally understandable but needed better organization.
0	0	4(1.6)	She presented information poorly and was hard to understand.

9. Which of the following most accurately describes the reactions of your students to the brushing and flossing program by the dental hygienist.

8(53.3)	3(27.3)	127(49.2)	Enthusiasm and motivation
6(40)	4(36.4)	98(38.0)	Moderate enthusiasm
1(6.7)	4(36.4)	28(10.9)	Mildly interested
0	0	5(2.0)	Did not seem impressed or motivated

10. Do you feel that you would have been as successful in teaching brushing and flossing without the hygienist's help?

1(7.1)	6(54.5)	92(33.1)	yes
13(92.9)	5(45.5)	186(66.9)	no

11. How often would you like a hygienist to assist you in teaching brushing and flossing?

1(6.7)	3(27.3)	32(12.2)	not again
12(80)	8(72.7)	210(79.8)	once a year
2(13.3)	1(9.1)	13(5.0)	once every two years
0	0	8(3.0)	once every three years.

12. How many times during the program did your students brush and/or floss in the classroom.

14(93.3)	5(45.5)	135(51.7)	everyday
0	0	14(5.4)	2x week
0	0	16(6.1)	3x week
0	2(18.2)	23(8.8)	1-3x
0	3(27.3)	41(15.7)	4-6x
0	0	>(2.7)	7-10x
1(6.7)	1(9.1)	25(9.6)	more than 10x

13. How many of the Tattle Tooth lessons did you teach? _____

1(7.7)	0	6(2.5)	zero
0	1(10)	10(4.1)	1-2
1(7.7)	1(10)	32(13.2)	3-4
1(7.7)	1(10)	36(14.8)	5-6
1(7.7)	2(20)	32(13.2)	7-8
9(69.2)	5(50)	127(52.3)	9-10

Is there something you would like to tell us about the program?

_____

_____

_____

SCHOOL_____ CITY _____

We would appreciate your help in our efforts to continually upgrade the Tattle Tooth Program. Please complete this questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to the Bureau of Dental Health, Texas Department of Health.

Thank you,

We need to hear from you!

TOTALS (BY SCHOOL DISTRICT)

Please check the appropriate answer.

Grade _____

1. Describe the dental problems in your class.

Lackland	Southwest	South San Antonio	Southside	Somerset	
0	11(34.4)	26(32.1)	5(50)	4(33.3)	widespread and severe
5(62.5)	19(59.4)	52(64.2)	5(50)	8(66.7)	about normal
3(37.5)	0	0	0	0	rare
0	0	0	0	0	non-existent
0	2(6.2)	3(3.7)	0	0	don't know

2. How would you rate the changes in dental health that the Tattle Tooth Program has made in your class?

0	4(13.3)	18(22.8)	0	2(16.7)	drastic improvements
8(100)	24(80)	61(77.2)	9(90)	8(66.7)	slight changes
0	2(6.7)	0	1(10)	2(16.7)	no changes whatsoever
0	0	0	0	0	negative changes--things are worse than before

3. Which of the following most accurately sums up your feelings about the program?

5(62.5)	22(68.75)	63(81.8)	7(70)	8(80)	The program was well-conceived and put together.
0	6(18.75)	9(11.7)	1(10)	1(10)	The program needed better logistical planning.
3(37.5)	4(12.5)	5(6.5)	2(20)	1(10)	The educational part of the program should have been better planned.
0	0	0	0	0	The program was poorly put together.

4. Were you generally satisfied with the in-service training?

7(100)	29(93.5)	67(81.7)	8(80)	11(100)	Yes
0	2(6.5)	15(18.3)	2(20)	0	No

5. The dental-technical portion of the training was

5(62.5)	26(86.7)	68(86.1)	9(90)	10(100)	realistic and sufficient.
3(37.5)	4(13.3)	11(13.9)	1(10)	0	too sketchy.
0	0	0	0	0	not understandable.
0	0	0	0	0	misleading.

6. The educational component of the training was

7(100)	21(70)	61(79.2)	9(90)	8(80)	realistic and sufficient.
0	(930)	14(18.2)	1(10)	2(20)	too sketchy.
0	0	0	0	0	not understandable.
0	0	2(2.6)	0	0	misleading.

7. Which of the following would be the closest to your feelings about the dental hygienist's assistance when she was in your school.

8(100)	24(80)	74(90.2)	10(100)	11(100)	I found her help generally useful.
0	2(6.7)	0	0	0	She was unavailable when I needed her
0	3(10)	1(1.2)	0	0	She was not very helpful.
0	1(3.3)	7(8.5)	0	0	Her assistance was unnecessary.

8. Which of the following is the most accurate appraisal of the dental hygienist's approach in demonstrating brushing and flossing.

6(66.7)	22(71)	71(87.6)	9(90),	10(90.9)	She was very organized and clear.
3(33.3)	8(25.8)	8(9.9)	1(10)	1(9.1)	She was generally understandable but needed better organization.
0	1(3.2)	2(2.5)	0	0	She presented information poorly and was hard to understand.

9. Which of the following most accurately describes the reactions of your students to the brushing and flossing program by the dental hygienist.

6(66.7)	17(54.8)	49(59.7)	4(40)	4(36.4)	Enthusiasm and motivation
3(33.3)	12(38.7)	25(30.5)	4(40)	6(54.5)	Moderate enthusiasm
0	2(6.5)	5(6.1)	2(20)	1(9.1)	Mildly interested
0	0	3(3.7)	0	0	Did not seem impressed or motivated

10. Do you feel that you would have been as successful in teaching brushing and flossing without the hygienist's help?

4(50)	7(22.6)	26(32.9)	0	4(36.4)	yes
4(50)	24(77.4)	53(67.1)	9(100)	7(63.6)	no

11. How often would you like a hygienist to assist you in teaching brushing and flossing?

3(37.5)	3(10)	6(7.9)	0	2(18.2)	not again
5(62.5)	24(80)	66(86.8)	10(100)	6(54.5)	once a year
0	3(10)	3(3.9)	0	3(27.3)	once every two years
0	0	1(1.3)	0	0	once every three years.

12. How many time during the program did your students brush and/or floss in the classroom?

8(100)	16(51.6)	39(51.3)	3(33.3)	10(90.9)	everyday
0	0	0	1(11.1)	0	2x week
0	0	4(5.3)	2(22.2)	0	3x week
0	3(9.7)	7(9.2)	2(22.2)	1(9.1)	1-3x week
0	8(25.8)	10(13.2)	1(11.1)	0	4-6x
0	0	5(6.6)	0	0	7-10x
0	4(12.9)	11(14.5)	0	0	more than 10x

13. How many of the Tattle Tooth lessons did you teach? _____

0	0	0	0	3(27.3)	zero
0	0	1(1.3)	0	0	1-2
2(25)	1(3.6)	10(13.3)	5(50)	4(36.4)	3-4
0	5(17.9)	16(21.3)	0	0	5-6
1(12.5)	9(32.1)	9(12.0)	3(30)	0	7-8
5(62.5)	13(46.4)	39(52.0)	2(20)	4(36.4)	9-10

Is there something you would like to tell us about the program?

_____

_____

_____

SCHOOL _____ CITY _____

We would appreciate your help in our efforts to continually upgrade the Tattle Tooth Program. Please complete this questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to the Bureau of Dental Health, Texas Department of Health.

Thank you,

We need to hear from you!

TOTALS (BY SCHOOL DISTRICT CONT.)

Please check the appropriate answer.

Grade _____

1. Describe the dental problems in your class.

Medina Valley	Hondo	San Marcos	New Braunfels	Dripping Springs	
3(23.1)	5(45.5)	2(5.6)	7(29.2)	0	widespread and severe
10(76.9)	6(54.5)	23(91.7)	15(62.5)	9(90)	about normal
0	0	0	1(4.2)	1(10)	rare
0	0	0	0	0	non-existent
0	0	1(2.7)	1(4.2)	0	don't know

2. How would you rate the changes in dental health that the Tattle Tooth Program has made in your class?

4(30.8)	1(9.1)	3(9.4)	1(4.2)	2(20)	drastic improvements
9(69.2)	9(81.8)	26(81.3)	22(91.7)	8(80)	slight changes
0	1(9.1)	3(9.4)	1(4.2)	0	no changes whatsoever
0	0	0	0	0	negative changes--things are worse than before

3. Which of the following most accurately sums up your feelings about the program?

10(76.9)	3(37.5)	15(45.5)	9(37.5)	8(8.9)	The program was well-conceived and put together.
1(7.9)	2(2.5)	4(12.1)	6(25.0)	0	The program needed better logistical planning.
1(7.7)	0	10(30.3)	7(29.2)	1(1.1)	The educational part of the program should have been better planned.
1(7.7)	3(37.5)	1(3.0)	2(8.3)	0	The program was poorly put together.
		3(9.1)	no answer		

4. Were you generally satisfied with the in-service training?

11(84.6)	8(72.7)	23(69.7)	19(90.5)	10(100)	Yes
2(15.4)	3(27.3)	10(30.3)	2(9.5)	0	No

5. The dental-technical portion of the training was

10(76.9)	8(72.7)	21(72.4)	19(86.4)	9(100)	realistic and sufficient.
2(15.4)	2(18.2)	4(13.8)	2(9.1)	0	too sketchy.
0	0	3(10.3)	0	0	not understandable.
1(7.7)	1(9.1)	1(3.4)	1(4.5)	0	misleading.

6. The educational component of the training was

10(76.9)	7(63.6)	14(53.9)	15(68.2)	9(90)	realistic and sufficient.
3(23.1)	3(27.3)	7(26.9)	5(22.7)	1(10)	too sketchy.
0	1(9.1)	4(15.4)	2(9.1)	0	not understandable.
		1(3.8)	0	0	misleading.

7. Which of the following would be the closest to your feelings about the dental hygienist's assistance when she was in your school.

13(100)	6(66.7)	25(73.5)	20	10	I found her help generally useful.
0	2(27.3)	1(2.9)	0	0	She was unavailable when I needed her.
0	0	1(2.9)	0	0	She was not very helpful.
0	1(11.1)	7(20.6)	3	0	Her assistance was unnecessary.

8. Which of the following is the most accurate appraisal of the dental hygienist's approach in demonstrating brushing and flossing.

11(84.6)	3(30)	25	19	9	She was very organized and clear.
2(15.4)	6(60)	6	5	1	She was generally understandable but needed better organization.
0	1(10)	0	0	0	She presented information poorly and was hard to understend.

9. Which of the following most accurately describes the reactions of your students to the brushing and flossing program by the dental hygienist.

8(61.5)	2(18.2)	13(39.4)	9	4	Enthusiasm and motivation
3(23.1)	7(63.6)	11(33.3)	12	5	Moderate enthusiasm
2(15.4)	1(9.1)	8(24.2)	1	1	Mildly interested
0	1(9.1)	1(3.0)	0	0	Did not seem impressed or motivated

10. Do you feel that you would have been as successful in teaching brushing and flossing without the hygienist's help?

3(23.1)	4(36.4)	19	16	2	yes
10(76.9)	7(63.6)	33	13	8	no

11. How often would you like a hygienist to assist you in teaching brushing and flossing?

1(7.7)	3(30)	4	6	0	not again
11(84.6)	4(40)	25	15	9	once a year
0	0	0	1	0	once every two years
1(7.7)	3(30)	2	0	1	once every three years.

12. How many times during the program did your students brush and/or floss in the classroom?

9(69.2)	2(20)	17(56.7)	6(30.0)	6(67.0)	everyday
0	0	0	3(15.0)	0	2x week
0	0	1(3.3)	0	1(11.0)	3x week
0	0	0	7(35.0)	1(11.0)	1-3x
3(23.1)	7(70)	7(23.3)	2(10.0)	0	4-6x
0	0	1(3.3)	1(5.0)	0	7-10x
1(7.7)	1(10)	4(13.3)	1(5.0)	1(11.0)	more than 10x

13. How many of the Tattle Tooth lessons did you teach? _____

0	2(18.2)	0	0	0	zero
0	2(18.2)	4(13.3)	2(11.1)	0	1-2
1(8.3)	0	3(10.0)	4(22.2)	0	3-4
4(33.3)	1(9.1)	4(13.3)	4(22.2)	0	5-6
2(16.7)	0	1(3.3)	1(5.6)	3(30.0)	7-8
5(41.7)	6(54.6)	18(60.0)	7(38.9)	7(70.0)	9-10

Is there something you would like to tell us about the program?

_____

_____

_____

SCHOOL _____ CITY _____